CHEMICAL EVOLUTION OF IRREGULAR AND BLUE COMPACT GALAXIES

LETICIA CARIGI
Centro de Investigaciones de Astronomía, Apdo. Postal 264
Mérida 5101 – A, VENEZUELA
carigi@cida.ve

and

PEDRO COLÍN, MANUEL PEIMBERT and ANTONIO SARMIENTO
Instituto de Astronomía, UNAM, Apdo. Postal 70 – 264
04510 México, D. F., MEXICO
colin@astroscu.unam.mx, peimbert@astroscu.unam.mx, ansar@astroscu. unam.mx

Received *1994*

Abstract. We discuss the chemical evolution of metal poor galaxies and conclude that their oxygen deficiency is not due to: the production of black holes by massive stars or a varying slope of the Initial Mass Function, IMF, at the high-mass end. A varying IMF at the low-mass end alone or in combination with: (a) an outflow of oxygen-rich material, (b) an outflow of well-mixed material, and (c) the presence of dark matter that does not participate in the chemical evolution process, is needed to explain their oxygen deficiency. Outflow of material rich in O helps to account for the large $\Delta Y/\Delta$O values derived from these objects, but it works against explaining the $(Z - \mathrm{C} - \mathrm{O})/\mathrm{O}$ and C/O values.

Subject headings: galaxies:abundances - galaxies:evolution - galaxies:interstellar matter - stars:evolution - stars:luminosity function

1. INTRODUCTION

By studying the O-μ diagram for irregular and blue compact galaxies, where O is the oxygen abundance mass fraction and μ is the gas mass fraction, it is found that for a given μ value, the O value is smaller than the one predicted by the closed-box model of chemical evolution with an IMF independent of Z. In a review of this problem by Peimbert, Colín, & Sarmiento (1994a), it is argued that the small O values are not due to: (*a*) errors in the O determination, (*b*) inflow, (*c*) variations of the slope of the IMF at the high-mass end, or (*d*) the production of black holes by massive stars. Alternatively, these authors argue that the observed values in the O-μ diagram could be due to: (*a*) outflow, (*b*) variations of the IMF at the low-mass end, (*c*) the presence of dark matter that does not participate in the chemical evolution process, or (*d*) errors in the determination of the total mass of the galaxies, M_T. We shall make quantitative estimates of some of these effects based on a comparison of chemical evolution models of galaxies with observations. In addition to the O and μ values, we have three additional observational restrictions that can be used to constrain the models: the enhancement in the helium to oxygen mass ratio, $\Delta Y/\Delta$O, the carbon to oxygen mass ratio, C/O, and the heavy elements minus carbon and oxygen to oxygen mass ratio, (Z − C − O)/O.

In § 2 we describe the chemical evolution models of galaxies, in § 3 we select ten objects from the best observed ones and obtain representative values for O, μ, $\Delta Y/\Delta$O, C/O, and (Z − C − O)/O, values that should be reproduced by the models. In § 4 we compare the observational constraints with the predictions made by closed-box models with a varying mass threshold, $m_{\rm bh}$ (hereafter m denotes mass in solar mass units), for the end of the evolution of massive stars as black holes (i. e., without enriching the interstellar medium, ISM, with the heavy elements that are ejected when the massive stars explode in supernovae events, SNe); these models are computed without the assumption of the instant recycling approximation, IRA (i. e., taking into account the time delay involved in the ISM enrichment), for two families of IMF's, and variable ages. In § 5 we present two types of galactic outflow models and compare them with the observations. Finally, the discussion and conclusions are presented in § 6.

2. CHEMICAL EVOLUTION MODEL

2.1 Main Features

Our chemical evolution model for irregular galaxies takes into account the dependence of the element yields with the metallicity of the parent galaxy, it is essentially the model presented by Carigi (1994) for the solar neighborhood with the following modifications: a well-mixed or an O-rich galactic wind is added, the infall is excluded, and the initial gas abundances are chosen as pregalactic ($X_p = 0.77$, $Y_p = 0.23$, and $Z_p = 0$). Our model considers ages of $t_g = 0.1$, 1, and 10 Gyr; that is, models are differentiated from each other in the sense that they reproduce the representative μ and O values at different times: 0.1, 1, and 10 Gyr. Prantzos et al. (1994) have also presented chemical evolution models of the Galaxy taking into account the effect of metallicity dependent yields.

The model by Carigi (1994) is an open one in which the yields, the lifetimes of stars, the masses of the remnant stars and the masses of SNe progenitors, all depend on the metallicity of the progenitor cloud. The IRA is not used and the evolution of H, ^{4}He, ^{12}C, ^{16}O, ^{56}Fe, and Z is modelled in detail; in particular, the He content does not increase linearly with metallicity. The star formation rate, ψ, is taken proportional to the gas mass: $\psi = \nu M_{gas}$. The stellar yields are non-linearly interpolated from the set of metallicities presented by Maeder (1992), a procedure based on the results by Maeder (1991). Prantzos et al. (1994) also point out that a non-linear interpolation for the yields improves the agreement of model predictions with observations in the Galaxy. The main sequence lifetimes have been obtained from Schaller et al. (1992). The stars are divided into two mass intervals: (*a*) low-mass stars (LMS), which are those with initial masses, m_i, in the $0.8 < m_i < 7.5$ range, and (*b*) high-mass stars (HMS), those with initial masses in the $7.5 \leq m_i < 120$ interval. For LMS, the C, O, and Z yields are taken from Renzini & Voli ($Z = 0.004$ and 0.02, $\alpha = 1.5$, $\eta = 1/3$, 1981), and the He yield and remnant masses from Maeder (including stellar winds, 1992). For HMS, all yields and remnant masses are taken from Maeder (high-mass loss rate, 1992). Three types of SNe are taken into account: Ia, Ib, and II. For SNe Ib, two possible progenitors are considered: Wolf-Rayet stars and binary systems; for this type of SNe, the Fe mass enrichment is 0.15 $M_\odot$, while for SNe II it is taken as 0.075 $M_\odot$ (Nomoto, Shigeyama, & Tsujimoto, 1990).

2.2 Stellar Models

Since the yields calculated by Maeder (1992, 1993) are extensively used in what follows, we briefly describe the main features of the models by Maeder and collaborators; these are:

- Stars with m_i from 0.1 to 0.8, do not contribute to the interstellar gas enrichment and only take gas from the ISM when they are formed; their main sequence lifetimes are greater than the age of the parent galaxy.

- Stars with initial masses in the interval $0.8 \leq m_i < 1.85$ burn He in degenerate cores and end their lives as C-O white dwarfs. Theses stars enrich the ISM mainly with He, C, and N via stellar winds and planetary nebulae events; their main sequence lifetimes vary from 1 to 25 Gyr depending on initial mass and metallicity.

- Stars in the interval $1.85 \leq m_i < 7.5$ burn He in non-degenerate cores and when going through the asymptotic giant branch, enrich the ISM with He, C, and N via stellar winds until their existence ends in a C-O degenerate core after the ejection of a planetary nebula, their main sequence lifetimes range from 0.03 to 1 Gyr; these stars, if in binary systems, may produce SNe I and contribute to the Fe enrichment, mainly.

- Stars in the range $7.5 \leq m_i < m_{wr}$ (lower-limit mass for the formation of a Wolf-Rayet star) burn elements heavier than He and mainly eject He, C, N, and O via SNe II; their main sequence lifetimes vary slightly with the initial chemical content and go from 0.003 to 0.03 Gyr. Appropriate values for m_{wr} are 25 for a solar metallicity, or 75 for a twentieth of the solar metallicity.

- Stars with initial masses greater than m_{wr} and low metallicity, contribute to the ISM enrichment with He, C, and O via SNe Ib and leave a massive remnant; for stars in the same mass range and high metallicities, the strong contribution to He and C, mainly, is via stellar winds and therefore, their remnants are less massive. Their lifetimes are less than 0.006 Gyr.

2.3 Initial Mass Functions

We have considered two initial mass functions: the first one is an extension of the IMF for the solar neighborhood derived by Kroupa, Tout & Gilmore (1993) to lower masses in order to take into account substellar objects (KTG IMF, hereafter), and the second one is the Salpeter (1955) IMF (or S IMF). Both IMFs are normalized to one; that is,

$$\int_{m_l}^{m_u} m\xi(m)dm = 1. \tag{2.1}$$

The lower and upper limits of the IMFs are considered to be 0.01 and 120, respectively.

The KTG IMF is given by:

$$\xi(m) = \begin{cases} 0.510\ m^{-1.3} & \text{if } 0.01 \leq m < 0.5\ , \\ 0.273\ m^{-2.2} & \text{if } 0.5\ \ \leq m < 1.0\ , \\ 0.273\ m^{-2.7} & \text{if } 1.0\ \ \leq m < 120\ , \end{cases} \tag{2.2}$$

where $\xi(m)dm$ is the number of stars in the mass interval from m to $m + dm$. For masses in the range $0.08 \leq m < 0.5$, KTG find that the exponent for the 95 per cent confidence interval varies from in -0.70 to -1.85 and the center is given by -1.3. The KTG IMF has the same slope for $m \geq 1$ as the Scalo (1986) IMF, i. e., the two IMFs have a different slope only for the $m < 1$ values. Though it has been ruled out by observations of the solar vicinity a while ago (Scalo 1986), the Salpeter IMF with a -2.35 value for the slope from $m = 0.01$ to 120 will be considered for comparison.

3. OBSERVATIONAL CONSTRAINTS

We will generate a series of models with the aim of fitting μ, O, $\Delta Y/\Delta$O, C/O, and $(Z - \mathrm{C} - \mathrm{O})/\mathrm{O}$ for a 'typical' irregular galaxy. Thus, for any given galaxy, we need to know the values for these five constraints; however, it is not possible to derive $\Delta Y/\Delta$O for a single galaxy, and a determination using only a pair of galaxies would have a very poor quality; therefore, we will derive this value using the average ratio from a group of well-observed galaxies. The other four constraints will be obtained from average or representative values of the galaxies in this well-observed group.

3.1 M_T, μ, and O

In Table 1 we present a group of ten galaxies with well-determined μ, O, and Y values. The data come from the following sources: (*a*) the Y values are taken from Lequeux et al. (1979), Pagel (1987), Torres-Peimbert, Peimbert, & Fierro (1989), Skillman (1991), Pagel et al. (1992, hereafter PSTE), Skillman and Kennicutt (1993), and Skillman et al. (1994); (*b*) the Z values are derived from the observed N(O)/N(H) values under the assumption that O constitutes 54 % of the total Z value (see below), the N(O)/N(H) ratios are taken from Peimbert & Torres-Peimbert (1976), Dufour, Shields, & Talbot (1981), Kunth & Sargent (1983), Vigroux, Stasinska, & Comte (1987), Skillman, Kennicutt, & Hodge (1989), Garnett (1990), Schmidt & Boller (1993), Skillman and Kennicutt (1993), and Skillman et al. (1994); (*c*) the gaseous mass, M_{gas}, the total mass, M_T, and their ratio, μ, are

taken from Lequeux et al. (1979), and Staveley-Smith, Davies, & Kinman (1992). The colons after the μ values in the first two lines of Table 1 indicate that the M_T values are very uncertain for these two galaxies. The values of the total mass shown in Table 1 were obtained dynamically, therefore they include any possible dark matter material, either baryonic or non-baryonic. Our models assume that M_T is due only to: the gaseous component, stars, substellar objects, and stellar remnants. The outflow models start with a higher total mass and reach the M_T value at the end of the evolution of each model. The last line in Table 1 contains the average values of the data in the previous rows.

Since the average abundance values are calculated linearly, the relevance of the O-poor objects is much less than when the average values are calculated using the logarithms of the corresponding data. The representative value for $\Delta Y/\Delta \mathrm{O}$ is determined by the whole set of observations and the role of the first two galaxies in our sample is mainly to help determine the value for the primordial He.

The adopted values in this paper are: $\log\mu = -0.53$, and $\log(M_T/M_\odot) = 9.12$. These values are slightly different to the average values presented in Table 1, nevertheless, a discussion on the effect produced by varying μ is given in § 4 and § 6. The O values in Table 1 were derived by: (*a*) adopting a uniform electron temperature over the observed H II region, and (*b*) neglecting the fraction of O atoms tied up in dust grains.

From observations of H II regions in the solar neighborhood, it has been found that temperature variations along the line of sight increase the O/H ratio by about 0.3 dex (e. g. Peimbert, Torres-Peimbert, & Ruiz, 1992; Peimbert, Storey, & Torres-Peimbert, 1993a; Peimbert, Torres-Peimbert, & Dufour, 1993b). From the study of a set of metal poor H II galaxies, Campbell (1988) finds that the O/H ratios based on temperatures derived from the [O III] 4363/5007 ratio, should be increased by factors in the 0.03 to 0.3 dex range, while from a similar set of objects, McGaugh (1991) finds that the O/H ratios should be increased by about 0.2 dex due to temperature variations along the line of sight. These temperature variations could be due to: (*a*) the deposition of mechanical energy inside H II regions by stellar winds and SNe explosions (e. g. Peimbert, Sarmiento and Fierro, 1991 and references therein), and (*b*) the presence of chemical abundance inhomogeneities. From this discussion and based mainly on the results by McGaugh (1991), Campbell (1988), and González-Delgado et al. (1994), we shall assume that the gaseous O/H ratio should be increased by 0.16 dex due to the temparature structure inside H II regions.

Dufour et al. (1994) have found that the ratio Si/O in irregular galaxies is from 1.5

to 3 times smaller than the solar value, indicating that an important fraction of the Si atoms is in the form of dust grains; this result implies that about 10 % of the O atoms are trapped by Si, Mg and Fe in dust grains. Consequently, the O abundance should be increased by 0.04 dex. These two corrections increase the O average value in Table 1 from 1.63×10^{-3} to 2.58×10^{-3}.

3.2 $\Delta Y/\Delta$O

From a linear regression of the sample, it is found that $\Delta Y/\Delta \mathrm{O} = 7.10 \pm 1.62$. ΔO should be increased by 0.2 dex to take into account the temperature structure of the H II regions and the fraction of O embedded in dust; alternatively, ΔY is not affected by these two effects since the temperature structure diminishes the Y determinations but does not affect ΔY up to a very good approximation, and no He is expected to be in dust grains. Hence, we obtain for our sample that $\Delta Y/\Delta \mathrm{O} = 4.48 \pm 1.02$, and in the following we shall adopt $\log(\Delta Y/\Delta \mathrm{O}) = 0.65 \pm 0.11$ as the representative value to be fitted by our models.

We shall compare our $\Delta Y/\Delta$O determinations with those derived by other authors; in particular with PSTE, one of the most important data sets found in the literature. From these data it is found that $\Delta Y/\Delta \mathrm{O} = 10.2 \pm 3.5$, and combining them with the sample by Isotov, Thuan & Lipovetsky (1994), it is found that $\Delta Y/\Delta \mathrm{O} = 9.7 \pm 2.8$. These values have been derived under the assumption of a uniform temperature inside the H II regions and without considering the amount of O embedded in dust grains, therefore in good agreement with the values derived from our sample.

From a comparison of Y_p with the O and Y abundances of the solar vicinity, Peimbert, Sarmiento & Colín (1994b) have determined a value of $\Delta Y/\Delta \mathrm{O} = 5.22 \pm 1.1$, which is in excellent agreement with the value adopted by us for irregular galaxies.

3.3 C/O

The C/O ratio varies with O from a low value of about -1.1 dex for O-poor objects, to a high value of about -0.3 dex for the solar vicinity (Garnett et al., 1994; Peimbert, 1993 and references therein). For the C/O constraint we shall consider well observed objects with O values similar to those of our 'typical' irregular galaxy; these are: 30 Doradus in the LMC and NGC 2363 in NGC 2366. For 30 Doradus and NGC 2363, Garnett et al. obtain -0.60 ± 0.26 dex and -0.75 ± 0.15 dex, respectively, while Peimbert, Peña & Torres-

Peimbert (1986) obtain -0.65 ± 0.15 dex for NGC 2363. These results are not affected by the temperature structure since the lines used to derive the C and O abundances have similar excitation energies, and to a very good approximation the temperature structure cancels out. These three determinations correspond to the gaseous component and do not include the O trapped in dust grains. From these determinations and assuming that the fraction of O trapped in dust grains amounts to 0.04 dex, we shall adopt for the C/O ratio the value of -0.70 ± 0.15 dex.

We are assuming that the fraction of C embedded in dust grains is negligible. For the MNR/Draine-Lee grains (Mathis, Rumpl & Nordsieck, 1977; Draine & Lee, 1984), made by a combination of silicate and graphite grains, the strenghts of the 9.7 μm and 18 μm absorption features imply that practically all the Si atoms are in the Si$-$O stretch and consequently, that the amount of SiC is negligible (Mathis, 1994: private communication). On the other hand, the 2175 Å bump, narrower in the H II regions than in the general ISM, is probably due to the removal of dust coatings by the higher radiation field and higher grain temperatures (Mathis, 1994), and the high C/H values in the Orion nebula and M17 (Peimbert, Torres-Peimbert & Ruiz, 1992; Peimbert, 1993) also indicate that not much C is trapped by dust inside H II regions. In any case, a change in the adopted C/O constraint by 0.1 dex does not modify considerably our main conclusions (see Figures 2 and 5).

3.4 $(Z - \mathrm{C} - \mathrm{O})/\mathrm{O}$

To determine the $(Z - \mathrm{C} - \mathrm{O})/\mathrm{O}$ value, we shall consider again the best observed irregular galaxies with O values similar to those of our 'typical' irregular galaxy; these objects are 30 Doradus and NGC 2363. For 30 Doradus we shall take the C/O ratio from Garnett et al. (1994) and the N, O, Ne, S, and Ar values presented in Torres-Peimbert et al. (1989), increasing the O value by 0.04 dex to include the O trapped in dust grains. We shall assume that the mass ratio of all the other unobserved heavy elements to O is the same as in the sun: 36 % (Grevesse & Anders, 1989; Grevesse et al., 1990; Biémont et al., 1991; Holweger et al., 1991; and Hannaford et al., 1992). From these values we obtain $(Z - \mathrm{C} - \mathrm{O})/\mathrm{O} = 0.645$ and $\mathrm{O}/Z = 0.534$ for 30 Doradus. For NGC 2363 we shall take an average of the C/O ratios by Garnett et al. (1994) and Peimbert et al. (1986), while for N, O, Ne, S, and Ar we shall take the values from Peimbert et al. With the same assumptions as those adopted for 30 Doradus, we obtain that $(Z - \mathrm{C} - \mathrm{O})/\mathrm{O} = 0.660$ and $\mathrm{O}/Z = 0.543$;

these values can be compared to the solar ones that are 0.726 and 0.488, respectively, the differences are due to the smaller C/O and N/O values present in the irregular galaxies relative to the solar ones. From 30 Doradus and NGC 2363 we have adopted the value $\log[(Z - \mathrm{C} - \mathrm{O})/\mathrm{O}] = -0.18 \pm 0.06$.

4. CLOSED BOX MODELS

We have computed a series of closed box models –with and without the contribution of SNe I, for various IMFs, ages, and CO-core masses at the end of the C-burning phase, $m_{\rm co}$– in order to fit the adopted $\log\mu$ value of our sample and two possible values of O: 1.62×10^{-3}, and 2.58×10^{-3}. The variation of the CO core mass was used in order to study the suggestion by Maeder (1992, 1993), in the sense that black holes could play an important role in the chemical evolution of metal poor galaxies; the models assumed that the entire star becomes a black hole if the mass of the CO-core is larger than $m_{\rm co}$.

In Figures 1, 2, and 3, a dot represents a model with an age of 10 Gyr, the KTG IMF, and $m_{\rm co} = 60$ (that is, without the presence of black holes), that fits the adopted values: $\log\mu = -0.53$ and $\mathrm{O} = 2.58 \times 10^{-3}$. This model considers the contributions of SNe I of binary origin under the assumption that 5.7 % and 2.4 % of the binary systems become SNe Ia and Ib, respectively; these are the fractions needed to adjust the current SNe rates in the solar vicinity (see Carigi, 1994). The SNe I contributions to O and Z are only 2.3 % and 10.1 % respectively; moreover, the SNe I rates of irregular galaxies are not well known. For the 0.1 and 1 Gyr series of models, the contributions of SNe I to the chemical evolution of galaxies are completely negligible. Based on the previous discussion, the SNe I have not been taken into account for all the other models in this paper.

In Figures 1, 2, and 3, we also present three series of models for the KTG IMF with different ages and one series of models for the S IMF with 10 Gyr. In Figure 3, the KTG curves for the 1 and 10 Gyr series are almost identical because the contributions by stars in the $0.9 < m_i < 1.85$ range to the $(Z - \mathrm{C} - \mathrm{O})/\mathrm{O}$ ratio are almost negligible. In Figures 1 and 2 the increase of $\Delta Y/\Delta\mathrm{O}$ and C/O with t_g is due to the C and He enrichment of the ISM by LMS. The differences presented in Figures 1, 2, and 3 between the KTG-10 Gyr and the S series are mainly due to the larger number of stars in the $0.9 < m_i < 7.5$ interval in the KTG IMF compared to that in the S IMF.

Table 2 summarizes the results obtained by eight models with an age of 10 Gyr, a KTG IMF, and an initial mass gas of $1.33 \times 10^9 M_\odot$. Seven of these models fit $\log\mu = -0.53$ and

$O = 2.58 \times 10^{-3}$ (see Table 1), while the eighth model fits the adopted logμ value and $O = 1.62 \times 10^{-3}$; the changes in the element ratios between the first and last rows in Table 2 are due to the dependence of the element yields on the initial Z. The first column shows $m_{\rm co}$ values (related to $m_{\rm bh}$ according to Maeder, 1992). The two values present in the second column indicate the lowest stellar mass for the formation of a black hole when $Z = 0.001$, and to the same limit when each one of the models reaches its maximum metallicity. The third column shows the factor, r, by which the number of stars that contribute to the ISM enrichment has to be reduced in order to fit the adopted logμ and O values. The remaining columns give the values of the He, C, and Z abundances by mass, and some combinations of them.

In Table 3 we present the mass budget of the ISM from the different processes considered in four models with $m_{\rm co} = 60$ (i. e., no black holes present) and the KTG IMF. The different columns stand for: 1) age of the model, 2) chemical species, 3) mass lost by star formation (SF), 4) mass ejected by low-mass stars (LMS), 5) mass ejected by the winds of high-mass stars (HMS$_W$), 6) mass ejected by SNe explosions (HMS$_{\rm SN}$), and 7) the ISM abundance by mass. In the contributions by the different stellar ejecta, both, the material already present and the material synthesized within the stars, are included.

From Table 2 and Figures 1, 2, and 3 it follows that there is not a unique $m_{\rm co}$ value that fits the three observational restrictions for the 10 Gyr models. There are two extreme solutions that can be adopted: (*a*) we can fit the $\Delta Y/\Delta$O value with $m_{\rm co} = 16.4$ that corresponds to an $r = 1.97$ but without satisfying the C/O and $(Z-{\rm C}-{\rm O})/{\rm O}$ restrictions, or (*b*) we can fit C/O and $(Z-{\rm C}-{\rm O})/{\rm O}$ with $m_{\rm co} = 60$ and $r = 3.39$ but without satisfying the $\Delta Y/\Delta$O restriction. Note that the S IMF series and the KTG IMF 0.1 and 1 Gyr series predict even smaller $\Delta Y/\Delta$O values than the KTG-10 Gyr series. Since star formation in the LMC and the SMC has been going on for about 10 Gyr, we consider the 10 Gyr series more adequate.

Carigi (1994) and Peimbert et al. (1994) have found that the production of black holes by massive stars does not play an important role in the chemical evolution of the ISM in the solar vicinity. This result combined with the C/O and $(Z-{\rm C}-{\rm O})/{\rm O}$ constraints, has led us to consider that the (*b*) possibility of the previous paragraph is more likely. The SNe I contributions increase the predicted $(Z-{\rm C}-{\rm O})/{\rm O}$ and C/O ratios by about 20 % and 2 %, respectively, making the presence of black holes more unlikely (see Figures 2, and 3).

To reduce the O production, we have to adopt an IMF with a smaller fraction of massive stars relative to all the other stars. This can be done by either steepening the slope of the high-mass end of the IMF, or by increasing the amount of objects in the $0.01 < m < 1$ interval relative to those in the $1 < m < 120$ interval.

There are four arguments against changes in the slope at the high-mass end of the IMF with metallicity: (a) the study of the ionization degree of many extragalactic H II regions in irregular and blue compact galaxies with different O content (McGaugh, 1991); (b) the observed continuum in the 1100–7500 Årange of starburst regions with different O content in M101 (Rosa & Benvenuti, 1994); (c) direct determinations of the high-mass end slope in the SMC and the LMC (Massey et al., 1989a, b; Parker et al., 1992; Parker & Garmany, 1993); and (d) since a more negative slope at the high-mass end of the IMF would also increase the predicted $(Z - \mathrm{C} - \mathrm{O})/\mathrm{O}$ and C/O values, producing a conflict with the observations.

On the other hand, observational evidence and arguments in favor of a change at the low-mass end of the IMF, in the sense that the lower the metallicity the larger the amount of small mass stars, have been presented previously (Peimbert & Serrano, 1982; Gusten & Mezger, 1983; Larson, 1986; Richer et al., 1991).

In what follows we will consider that the r values higher than one come from varying the IMF at its low-mass end; for simplicity, we will assume that it is the slope of the IMF which varies in the $0.01 < m < 0.5$ range. In this case r can be computed as follows:

$$r = \frac{\int_{m_l}^{120} m\xi(m)dm}{\int_{m_l}^{120} m\xi'(m)dm}, \tag{4.1}$$

where m_l is any value greater than 0.5, $\xi(m)$ is the KTG IMF, and $\xi'(m)$ is a slope-modified IMF; both IMFs are normalized to one. Our results produce a slope for $\xi'(m)$ in the $0.01 < m < 0.5$ interval, whose absolute value increases with r: for the $r > 1$ values shown in the first five rows of Table 2 we obtained, for a decreasing r, the following values for the slope: -2.38, -2.32, -2.21, -2.01, and -1.76. For the model with the S IMF and $m_{\rm co} = 60$, an r value of 3.20 is obtained, very similar to the r value derived with the KTG IMF. The value 0.5 for m_l comes from one of the points where the KTG IMF changes its slope; however, this point may be moved up to 1 (adjusting the slope correspondingly) without any change in the predicted abundance ratios.

The change in O from 2.58×10^{-3} to 1.62×10^{-3} does not affect significatively the O/Z, $(Z-\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{O})/\mathrm{O}$, $\Delta Y/\Delta\mathrm{O}$, and C/O ratios, the largest change is for the $(Z-\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{O})/\mathrm{O}$ ratio

and amounts to 3.6 %. Thus, if an observational error in the determination of O exists and is of the order of a factor of two, then the conclusions derived from the abundance ratios will still be valid. In addition, the change in the r parameter is inversely proportional to the change in the O abundance.

Similarly, an analysis of the influence of the μ parameter on the predictions by the models, shows that an increase in μ of 10 % produces a decrease in r of 7.32 %, and a decrease in μ of 10 % produces an increase in r of 7.96 %. Furthermore, the changes in O/Z, (Z – C – O)/O, $\Delta Y/\Delta$O, and C/O are smaller than 0.5 %; these models keep M_T constant and vary M_{gas}.

5. OUTFLOW MODELS

5.1 Outflow of well-mixed material

The adopted logμ and O values can also be fitted by assuming that galaxies are ejecting well-mixed material to the intergalactic medium via an ordinary galactic wind. In chemical evolution models with the IRA assumption, an ordinary wind is introduced by assuming an outflow modelled by $f_O = \lambda(1 - R)\psi$, where R is the mass fraction returned to the interstellar medium by a generation of stars. In our models, this wind is introduced as an outflow given by $f_O = \alpha M_{gas}$, where the α parameter is then related to λ through $\alpha = \lambda(1 - R)\nu$. Notice that R is ill defined in the models that do not assume the IRA, nevertheless an average R value has been defined and used to compute the λ parameter. Models with an outflow of well-mixed material, a KTG IMF, no black holes, and $r = 1$, are shown in Table 4. The first column shows the different ages of the model, the second contains the ratio of the ejected mass, M^e_{gas}, to the total mass, the third and fourth show the values of the α and λ parameters, the fifth shows the mass fraction that remains trapped in stars, $(1 - R)$, and the last four columns show the O/Z, (Z – C – O)/O, $\Delta Y/\Delta$O, and C/O values, respectively.

The $\Delta Y/\Delta$O values of the models in Table 4 are larger than those predicted by closed-box models due to the delay of the He production relative to that of O; this delay causes a preferential O loss to the intergalactic medium.

The increase in the $\Delta Y/\Delta$O ratios produced by outflow of well-mixed material relative to those produced by closed-box models goes in the right direction but is not large enough to explain the observational constraint; this is one of the reasons that has led to the idea

of a different type of galactic outflow.

5.2 Outflow of O-rich material

It has been proposed that an outflow of O-rich material is present, at least in some galaxies, to explain: (*a*) the small yield in heavy elements seen in irregular galaxies (Lequeux 1989; Tosi 1994; Peimbert et al. 1994a), (*b*) the large helium abundances derived in some irregular and blue compact galaxies (Aparicio, García-Pelayo, & Moles 1988), (*c*) the large $\Delta Y/\Delta \mathrm{O}$ ratios derived from samples of galaxies (Aparicio et al. 1988; Lequeux 1989; Pilyugin 1993; Tosi 1994; Peimbert et al. 1994a; Marconi, Matteucci & Tosi, 1994), (*d*) the high Fe/O ratio in the Magellanic Clouds (Russell, Bessell, & Dopita 1988a,b; Lequeux 1989) and (*e*) the Z-Mass relation present in irregular galaxies (De Young & Gallagher 1990).

By assuming that a fraction γ of the mass of a SN is ejected to the intergalactic medium without mixing with the interstellar gas, several models with a KTG IMF for different values of the parameter γ have been calculated in order to fit the adopted $\log\mu$ and O values, these models are shown in Tables 5 and 6 and Figures 4, 5, and 6, where the curves are non-linear fits to the computed models (solid squares). The inclusion of SNe I in these models produces a situation analogous to the one produced for the closed models and the resulting predictions are similar to the ones indicated by a dot in Figures 1, 2, and 3.

For a galactic age of 1 Gyr, about half of the freshly made He is ejected by stars in the 7.5–120 $M_\odot$ range and the other half, by stars in the 1.85–7.5 $M_\odot$ range, whereas almost all of the O, is produced by high-mass stars; meanwhile for a galactic age of 10 Gyr, stars in the 0.9–7.5 $M_\odot$ range produce about twice the He produced by high-mass stars. Low mass stars end their lives as white dwarfs and eject part of their masses in normal stellar winds during the red giant phase and as superwinds during the preplanetary nebula phase; on the other hand, stars in the 7.5–120 $M_\odot$ range, lose part of their masses via stellar winds and afterwards explode like SNe II, these ejecta have typical initial velocities of a few thousands of km s^{-1}, and so a fraction of the ejected mass might be expected to leave the parental galaxy.

The first column of Table 5 shows the galactic age; the chosen gamma values and the corresponding r values are shown in the second and third columns, respectively; the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh columns show the computed values of O/Z, $\Delta Y/\Delta \mathrm{O}$,

$(Z - \mathrm{C} - \mathrm{O})/\mathrm{O}$, and C/O, respectively; finally, the last column shows the ratio of the ejected mass, M^e_{gas}, to the total mass. As one would expect the $\Delta Y/\Delta\mathrm{O}$ value increases if the γ value increases. The gamma value with $r = 1$ means that the corresponding O-rich wind is sufficient to reproduce the adopted logμ and O values; i. e., there is no need for a modified IMF at the low-mass end. A value of r smaller than one indicates that the fraction of stars at the low-mass end of the IMF is smaller than that given by the KTG IMF.

As can be seen from Figures 4 and 5, for a given IMF, the dependence of $\Delta Y/\Delta\mathrm{O}$ and C/O with t_g is like the one reported above for the γ-dependence of $\Delta Y/\Delta\mathrm{O}$: if t_g increases, more C and He produced by the LMS will be ejected to the ISM and so the $\Delta Y/\Delta\mathrm{O}$ and C/O values increase; this behaviour is not followed by $(Z - \mathrm{C} - \mathrm{O})/\mathrm{O}$ when going from 1 to 10 Gyr (Fig. 6) since most of the $(Z - \mathrm{C} - \mathrm{O})$ elements are ejected by stars with $m_i > 1.85$. If γ increases, then r decreases and the number of stars that participate in the enrichment of the ISM increases, therefore, the production rate of any element increases. The non-linear fits to the models in Figures 4, 5, and 6 were obtained assuming that the logarithm of the ratio of any element to O varies as $a + b/[(1 - \gamma) + c]$, where a, b, and c are numbers to be determined for each element.

It follows from Figures 4, 5, and 6 that there is not a unique γ value that fits the three observational constraints at a given age. As in the case of the closed-box models, two possibilities can be followed: (a) to adopt models that fit the $\Delta Y/\Delta\mathrm{O}$ but not the C/O and $(Z - \mathrm{C} - \mathrm{O})/\mathrm{O}$ constraints (those with high γ and low r values, e. g., $\gamma = 0.6$ and $r = 1.4$ for a $t_g = 10$ Gyr), or (b) to adopt the models that reproduce de C/O and $(Z - \mathrm{C} - \mathrm{O})/\mathrm{O}$ but not the $\Delta Y/\Delta\mathrm{O}$ constraints (those with low γ and high r values, e. g., $\gamma = 0$ and $r = 3.39$ for the same $t_g = 10$ Gyr). It should be mentioned, however, that there is a model ($\gamma \sim 0.23$ and an $r \sim 2.66$ for a $t_g = 10$ Gyr) which barely fits the three observational constraints; note that this model requires a slope of -2.25 for the IMF in the $0.01 < m_i < 0.5$ interval, a value which is steeper than -1.3, the slope of the IMF for the solar vicinity in the same interval. This result for metal-poor galaxies supports the idea that the fraction of small-mass stars does decrease with increasing metallicity (Peimbert & Serrano, 1982; Gusten & Mezger, 1983; Larson, 1986; Richer et al., 1991).

Table 6 is the analogous of Table 3 including two additional columns: the second and the fifth, that show the γ values and the galactic wind contributions by gas mass, respectively.

6. CONCLUSIONS

We present chemical evolution models for irregular galaxies in order to try to fit five observational constraints. We study the parameter space provided by: (*a*) t_g, i. e., without IRA; (*b*) closed-box models varying $m_{\rm co}$, for each $m_{\rm co}$ a different r is needed to match logμ and O; (*c*) well-mixed outflow models with $r = 1$; and (*d*) O-rich outflow models varying γ, for each γ a different r is needed to match logμ and O.

As various authors have previously pointed out, closed models with a solar vicinity IMF do not explain the low O abundances.

The low O abundances require a change in the IMF: either a larger amount of low-mass stars or a change in the slope at the high-mass end. We present arguments against a change in the slope of the IMF at the high-mass end and conclude that the change should be at the low-mass end according to the r parameter defined by equation (4.1).

The production of black holes that prevent stars with masses higher than $m_{\rm bh}$ from enriching the ISM can explain μ, O, and $\Delta Y/\Delta$O with an $r = 1.97$ and $m_{\rm co}$= 16.4. This model fails to explain the C/O and $(Z - {\rm C} - {\rm O})$/O observational constraints. We consider that black holes do not play an important role in the chemical evolution of irregular galaxies due to their failure at explaining C/O and $(Z - {\rm C} - {\rm O})$/O, and also due to the results of chemical evolution models for the solar neighborhood that do not require them.

The best closed models are those without black holes, and among them, the one with $t_g = 10$ Gyr, a KTG IMF, and $r = 3.39$ is best since: (*a*) there is evidence of star formation during about 10 Gyr in Magellanic irregulars, (*b*) it explains μ, O, C/O, and $(Z - {\rm C} - {\rm O})$/O, and (*c*) it is the model that comes closer to explaining the $\Delta Y/\Delta$O constraint.

Errors or changes in O and μ of a factor of two or less, produce changes smaller than 4 % in the model-predicted $\Delta Y/\Delta$O, C/O, and $(Z - {\rm C} - {\rm O})$/O values. Alternatively, the changes in r are larger and: (*a*) are inversely proportional to the changes in O, and (*b*) proportional to changes in $log(\mu^{-1})$.

Our models have been obtained trying to fit the observational constraints of a 'typical' irregular galaxy, defined as the average of the properties of the ten selected galaxies in Table 1. Nevertheless, our models are robust and can be generalized to individual galaxies with changes of about a factor of two in O and a factor of two in μ, relative to our 'typical' irregular. This range of values includes most of the galaxies in Table 1 with the exception of the two metal poorest that might need a different set of chemical evolution models and that were mainly used to determine Y_p.

We computed outflow models with well-mixed material and $r = 1$ that fit μ, O, C/O, and $(Z - \mathrm{C} - \mathrm{O})/\mathrm{O}$. These models predict $\Delta Y/\Delta \mathrm{O}$ values closer to the observed ones but not close enough; they also predict large M^e_{gas}/M_T values, the ejected gas however, has probably dissipated for a $t_g = 10$ Gyr model and would be difficult to detect. Well-mixed outflow models made to fit μ and O with r values between 1 and those of the closed models would yield $\Delta Y/\Delta \mathrm{O}$, C/O, and $(Z - \mathrm{C} - \mathrm{O})/\mathrm{O}$ values intermediate between those presented in Table 4 and the closed-box models.

Outflow models of O-rich material with $\gamma = 0.23$ and $r = 2.66$ can marginally fit μ, O, $\Delta Y/\Delta \mathrm{O}$, C/O, and $(Z - \mathrm{C} - \mathrm{O})/\mathrm{O}$. Lower values of γ (requiring $r > 2.66$ values) fail to fit $\Delta Y/\Delta \mathrm{O}$; while larger values of γ (requiring $r < 2.66$ values) fail to fit C/O and $(Z - \mathrm{C} - \mathrm{O})/\mathrm{O}$. A better agreement with the three abundance ratios could be obtained for a smaller observed value of $\Delta Y/\Delta \mathrm{O}$, and this could be so if the effect on the O abundance due to the temperature structure of the H II regions is higher than the one adopted in this study.

The best fit to the five observational constraints is given by O-rich outflows with $\gamma = 0.23$ and $r = 2.66$. For this model we obtain a slope of -2.25 for the low-mass end of the IMF; this slope is intermediate between the KTG IMF slope of -1.3 and a slope smaller than -2.5 derived by Richer et al. (1991) for globular clusters. The metallicity of our 'typical' irregular galaxy is intermediate between that of the solar vicinity and those of the globular clusters, the change in the slope could therefore be due to a metallicity effect.

The authors express their gratitude to D. R. Garnett for reading the manuscript and for his excellent suggestions, and to J. S. Mathis for fruitful discussions. They also acknowledge a thorough arbitration by B. E. J. Pagel, whose criticism and comments helped to improve and clarify the manuscript.

REFERENCES

Aparicio, A., García-Pelayo, J. M., & Moles, M. 1988, A&AS, 74, 375

Biémont, E., Baudoux, M., Kurucz, R. L., Ansbacher, W., & Pinnington, E. H. 1991, A&A, 249, 539

Campbell, A. 1988, ApJ, 335, 644

Carigi, L. 1994, ApJ, 424, 181

De Young, D. S., & Gallagher, J. S. 1990, ApJ, 356, L15

de Vaucouleurs, G., de Vaucouleurs, A., Corwin, H. G., Buta, R. J., Paturel, G., & Fouqué, P. 1991, Third Reference Catalogue of Bright Galaxies (New York:Springer-Verlag)

Draine, B. T. & Lee, H. M. 1984, ApJ, 285, 89

Dufour, R. J., Shields, G. A., & Talbot, R. J. 1981, ApJ, 252, 461

Dufour, R. J., Walter, D. K., Garnett, D. R., Skillman, E. D., Peimbert, M., Torres-Peimbert, S., Terlevich, R. J., Terlevich, E., Shields, G. A., & Mathis, J. S. 1994, in preparation

Garnett, D. R. 1990, ApJ, 363, 142

Garnett, D. R., Skillman, E. D., Dufour, R. J., Peimbert, M., Torres-Peimbert, S., Terlevich, R. J., Terlevich, E., & Shields, G. A. 1994, ApJ, submitted

González-Delgado, R. M., Pérez, E., Tenorio-Tagle, G., Vílchez, J. M., Terlevich, E., Terlevich, R., Telles, E., Rodríguez-Espinosa, J. M., Mas-Hesse, M., García-Vargas, M. L., Díaz, A. I., Cepa, J., & Castañeda, H. O. 1994, ApJ, in press

Grevesse, N., & Anders, E. 1989, in Cosmic Abundances of Matter, ed. J. Waddington (New York: American Institute of Physics), 1

Grevesse, N., Lambert, D. L., Sauval, A. J., van Dishoeck, E. F., Farmer, C. B., & Norton, R. H. 1990, A&A, 232, 225

Gusten, R., & Mezger, P. G. 1983, Vistas Astr., 26, 159

Hannaford, P., Lowe, R. M., Grevesse, N., & Noels, A. 1992, A&A, 259, 301

Holweger, H., Bard, A., Kock, A., & Kock, M. 1991, A&A, 249, 545

Hutchmeier, W. K., & Richter, O. -G. 1988, A&A, 203, 237

Isotov, Y. I., Thuan, T. X., & Lipovetsky, V. A. 1994, ApJ, in press

Kroupa, P., Tout, C. A., & Gilmore, G. 1993, MNRAS, 262, 545 (KTG)

Kunth, K. D., & Sargent, W. L. W. 1983, ApJ 273, 81

Larson, R. B. 1986, MNRAS, 218, 409

Larson, R. B., & Tinsley, B. M. 1978, ApJ, 219, 46

Lequeux, J. 1989, in Evolution of Galaxies-Astronomical Observations, ed. I. Appenzeller, H. J. Habing, & P. Lena (Springer), p. 147

Lequeux, J., Peimbert, M., Rayo, J., Serrano, A., & Torres-Peimbert, S. 1979, A&A, 80, 155

Maeder, A. 1991, Pré-Publications de L'Observatoire de Genève, Série C, 84

——— 1992, A&A, 264, 105

——— 1993, A&A 268, 833

Marconi, G., Matteucci, F., & Tosi, M. 1994, MNRAS, in press

Massey, P., Garmany, C. D., Silkey, M., & DeGioia-Eastwood, D.K. 1989a, AJ, 97, 107

Massey, P., Parker, J. Wm., & Garmany, C. D. 1989b, AJ, 98, 1305

Mathis, J. S. 1994, ApJ, 422, 176

Mathis, J. S., Rumpl, W. & Nirdsieck, K. H. 1977, ApJ, 217, 425

McGaugh, S. S. 1991, ApJ, 380, 140

Nomoto, K., Shigeyama, T., & Tsujimoto, T. 1990, in IAU Symp. 145, Evolution of Stars: The Photospheric Abundance Connection, ed. G. Michaud & A. Tutukov (San Francisco: Book Crafters), 21

Pagel, B. E. J., 1987, in A Unified View of the Macro- & the Micro-cosmos, ed. A. de Rújula, D. V. Nanopoulos, and P. A. Shaver, (Singapore: World Scientific), p. 399

Pagel, B. E. J., Simonson, E. A., Terlevich, R. J., & Edmunds, M. G. 1992, MNRAS, 255, 325 (PSTE)

Parker, J. Wm., & Garmany, C. D. 1993, AJ, 106, 1471

Parker, J. Wm., Garmany, C. D., Massey, P., & Walborn, N. R. 1992, AJ, 103, 1205

Peimbert, M. 1993, Rev. Mexicana Astron. Af., 27, 9

Peimbert, M., Colín, P., & Sarmiento, A. 1994a, in Violent Star Formation from 30-Doradus to QSOs, ed. G. Tenorio-Tagle (Cambridge University Press), in press

Peimbert, M., Peña, M., & Torres-Peimbert, S. 1986, A&A, 158, 266

Peimbert, M., Sarmiento, A., & Colín, P. 1994b, Rev. Mexicana Astron. Af., 28, 181

Peimbert, M., Sarmiento, A., & Fierro, J. 1991, PASP, 103, 815

Peimbert, M., & Serrano, A. 1982, MNRAS, 198, 563

Peimbert, M., Storey, P. J., & Torres-Peimbert, S. 1993a, ApJ, 414, 626

Peimbert, M., & Torres-Peimbert, S, 1976, ApJ, 203, 581

Peimbert M., Torres-Peimbert, S., & Dufour, R. J. 1993b, ApJ, 418, 760

Peimbert, M., Torres-Peimbert, S., & Ruiz, M. T. 1992, Rev. Mexicana Astron. Af., 24, 155

Pilyugin, L. S. 1993, A&A, 277, 42

Prantzos, N., Vangioni-Flam, E. & Chauveau, S. 1994, A&A, 285, 132

Renzini A., & Voli, M. 1981, A&A, 94, 175

Richer, H. B., Fahlman, G. G., Buonanno, R., Fusi Pecci, F., Searle, L., & Thompson, I. B. 1991, ApJ, 381, 147

Rosa, M. R., & Benvenuti, P. 1994, A&A, in press

Russell, S. C., Bessell, M. S., & Dopita, M. A. 1988a, in Galactic and Extragalactic Star Formation, ed. R. E. Pudritz & M. Fich (Kluwer), p. 106

Russell, S. C., Bessell, M. S., & Dopita, M. A. 1988b, in The Impact of Very High S/N Spectroscopy, ed. G. Cayrel de Strobel & M. Spite (Kluwer), p. 545

Salpeter, E. E. 1955, ApJ, 121, 161 (S)

Scalo, J. M. 1986, Fund. Cosmic Phys., 11, 1

Schaller, G., Schaerer, D., Meynet, G., & Maeder, A. 1992, A&ASS, 96, 269

Schmidt, K. H., & Boller, T. 1993, Astron. Nachr., 314, 361

Skillman, E. D. 1991, PASP, 103, 919

Skillman, E. D., & Kennicutt, R. C. 1993, ApJ, 411, 655

Skillman, E. D., Kennicutt, R. C., & Hodge, P. W. 1989, ApJ, 347, 875

Skillman, E. D., Terlevich, R. J., Kennicut, R. C., Garnett, D. R., & Terlevich, E. 1994, ApJ, 431, 172

Staveley-Smith, L., Davies, R. D., & Kinman, T. D. 1992, MNRAS, 258, 334

Torres-Peimbert, S., Peimbert, M., & Fierro, J. 1989, ApJ, 345, 186

Tosi, M. 1994, preprint

Vigroux, L., Stasinska, G., & Comte, G. 1987, A&A, 172, 15

FIGURE CAPTIONS

FIGURE 1. $\Delta Y/\Delta \mathrm{O}$ *versus* m_{co} predicted by the closed models. The m_{co} values that correspond to a given initial mass m (or to a given m_{bh}), are from Maeder(1992). The region allowed by observations is shown by a shaded band. The point represents a model with a KTG IMF, a galactic time scale of 10 Gyr, and including SNe I of binary origin.

FIGURE 2. C/O *versus* m_{co} predicted by the closed models. The shaded band and the point have the same meaning as in Figure 1, i. e., the region allowed by observations and the prediction when SNe I are included; different lines follow also the convention of Figure 1.

FIGURE 3. $(Z - \mathrm{C} - \mathrm{O})/\mathrm{O}$ *versus* m_{co} predicted by the closed models. Regions, symbols, and notation have the same meaning as in the two previous figures.

FIGURE 4. $\Delta Y/\Delta \mathrm{O}$ *versus* γ assuming three different galactic ages. The models (solid squares) are adjusted by non-linear fits given by $a + b/[(1-\gamma) + c]$ (solid lines). The shaded band indicates the region allowed by observations.

FIGURE 5.- Analogue of Figure 4 for C/O.

FIGURE 6. Analogue of Figure 4 for $(Z - \mathrm{C} - \mathrm{O})/\mathrm{O}$. The 1 and 10 Gyr models are almost identical in this case; consequently, only the 10 Gyr model is presented.

TABLE 1

PROPERTIES OF SELECTED GALAXIES

Galaxy	$\log(M_T/M_\odot)$	$\log(M_{gas}/M_\odot)$	$\log\mu$	Y	10^3O	$10^3 Z$
I Zw 18	8.26	8.16	-0.1:	0.230	0.200	0.370
UGC 4483	7.94	7.84	-0.1:	0.239	0.403	0.746
Mrk 600	8.85	8.67	-0.18	0.240	1.241	2.297
SMC	9.18	8.80	-0.38	0.237	1.431	2.647
II Zw 40	8.87	8.40	-0.47	0.251	1.686	3.122
IC 10	9.73	9.11	-0.62	0.240	1.751	3.242
NGC 6822	9.23	8.28	-0.95	0.246	2.085	3.861
II Zw 70	9.11	8.58	-0.53	0.250	2.074	3.841
LMC	9.78	8.85	-0.93	0.250	2.608	4.829
NGC 4449	10.60	9.78	-0.82	0.251	2.856	5.288
Average[a]	9.15	8.65	-0.51	0.243	1.633	3.023

[a] Linear Regressions: $Y = (0.232 \pm 0.004) + (7.10 \pm 1.62) \times \mathrm{O}$, $Y = (0.232 \pm 0.004) + (3.83 \pm 0.87) \times Z$

TABLE 2

CLOSED BOX MODELS[a]

$m_{\rm co}$	$m_{\rm bh}$	r	He	10^3C	$10^3 Z$	$\frac{\rm O}{\rm Z}$	$\frac{Z-{\rm C}-{\rm O}}{\rm O}$	$\frac{\Delta Y}{\Delta {\rm O}}$	$\frac{\rm C}{\rm O}$
60	no BH	3.39	0.2376	0.619	5.00	0.516	0.700	2.946	0.240
40	88.2 – 106	3.05	0.2385	0.686	5.28	0.489	0.780	3.292	0.266
25	60.4 – 74.8	2.47	0.2406	0.848	5.96	0.433	0.983	4.108	0.329
15	42.0 – 52.8	1.84	0.2444	1.147	7.28	0.354	1.377	5.581	0.445
10	31.6 – 41.8	1.38	0.2497	1.578	9.12	0.283	1.924	7.636	0.612
7	25.1 – 24.8	0.92	0.2623	2.744	13.4	0.193	3.111	12.52	1.064
5	20.1 – 20.1	0.69	0.2774	4.572	17.8	0.144	4.146	18.37	1.772
60	no BH	5.29	0.2348	0.379	3.17	0.510	0.725	2.970	0.234

[a] For O $= 2.580 \times 10^{-3}$, with the exception of the last model which is for O $= 1.616 \times 10^{-3}$

TABLE 3

ISM ABUNDANCES BUDGET FOR CLOSED MODELS[a]

t_g (Gyr)	i	SF	LMS	$\mathrm{HMS_W}$	$\mathrm{HMS_{SN}}$	X_i
0.10	He	$-5.623{\cdot}10^{-1}$	$3.728{\cdot}10^{-3}$	$1.395{\cdot}10^{-3}$	$1.638{\cdot}10^{-2}$	$2.346{\cdot}10^{-1}$
	C	$-2.804{\cdot}10^{-4}$	$8.323{\cdot}10^{-6}$	$8.607{\cdot}10^{-6}$	$6.127{\cdot}10^{-4}$	$3.492{\cdot}10^{-4}$
	O	$-2.323{\cdot}10^{-3}$	$3.819{\cdot}10^{-6}$	$6.091{\cdot}10^{-6}$	$4.893{\cdot}10^{-3}$	$2.580{\cdot}10^{-3}$
	Z	$-3.835{\cdot}10^{-3}$	$2.331{\cdot}10^{-4}$	$2.062{\cdot}10^{-4}$	$7.877{\cdot}10^{-3}$	$4.481{\cdot}10^{-3}$
1.00	He	$-5.797{\cdot}10^{-1}$	$2.148{\cdot}10^{-2}$	$1.650{\cdot}10^{-3}$	$1.794{\cdot}10^{-2}$	$2.367{\cdot}10^{-1}$
	C	$-4.807{\cdot}10^{-4}$	$3.822{\cdot}10^{-4}$	$1.544{\cdot}10^{-5}$	$6.629{\cdot}10^{-4}$	$5.798{\cdot}10^{-4}$
	O	$-2.583{\cdot}10^{-3}$	$6.550{\cdot}10^{-5}$	$8.859{\cdot}10^{-6}$	$5.089{\cdot}10^{-3}$	$2.580{\cdot}10^{-3}$
	Z	$-4.867{\cdot}10^{-3}$	$1.348{\cdot}10^{-3}$	$2.991{\cdot}10^{-4}$	$8.192{\cdot}10^{-3}$	$4.972{\cdot}10^{-3}$
10.0	He	$-6.003{\cdot}10^{-1}$	$4.289{\cdot}10^{-2}$	$1.704{\cdot}10^{-3}$	$1.810{\cdot}10^{-2}$	$2.376{\cdot}10^{-1}$
	C	$-6.159{\cdot}10^{-4}$	$5.473{\cdot}10^{-4}$	$1.688{\cdot}10^{-5}$	$6.702{\cdot}10^{-4}$	$6.185{\cdot}10^{-4}$
	O	$-2.693{\cdot}10^{-3}$	$1.502{\cdot}10^{-4}$	$9.339{\cdot}10^{-6}$	$5.114{\cdot}10^{-3}$	$2.580{\cdot}10^{-3}$
	Z	$-5.256{\cdot}10^{-3}$	$1.725{\cdot}10^{-3}$	$3.191{\cdot}10^{-4}$	$8.217{\cdot}10^{-3}$	$5.004{\cdot}10^{-3}$
10.0	He	$-5.793{\cdot}10^{-1}$	$2.654{\cdot}10^{-2}$	$8.107{\cdot}10^{-4}$	$1.142{\cdot}10^{-2}$	$2.348{\cdot}10^{-1}$
	C	$-3.690{\cdot}10^{-4}$	$3.311{\cdot}10^{-4}$	$2.622{\cdot}10^{-6}$	$4.145{\cdot}10^{-4}$	$3.792{\cdot}10^{-4}$
	O	$-1.625{\cdot}10^{-3}$	$6.051{\cdot}10^{-5}$	$2.254{\cdot}10^{-6}$	$3.178{\cdot}10^{-3}$	$1.616{\cdot}10^{-3}$
	Z	$-3.194{\cdot}10^{-3}$	$1.006{\cdot}10^{-3}$	$8.889{\cdot}10^{-5}$	$5.266{\cdot}10^{-3}$	$3.167{\cdot}10^{-3}$

[a] Adjusting O $= 2.580 \times 10^{-3}$, with the exception of the last model which adjusts O $= 1.616 \times 10^{-3}$

TABLE 4

OUTFLOW OF WELL-MIXED MATERIAL[a]

t_g (Gyr)	$\frac{M^e_{gas}}{M_T}$	α (Gyr^{-1})	λ	$(1-R)$	$\frac{\mathrm{O}}{\mathrm{Z}}$	$\frac{Z-\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{O}}{\mathrm{O}}$	$\frac{\Delta Y}{\Delta \mathrm{O}}$	$\frac{\mathrm{C}}{\mathrm{O}}$
0.10	6.43	29.40	10.77	0.798	0.505	0.821	2.861	0.159
1.00	6.50	2.932	10.13	0.742	0.486	0.746	3.290	0.312
10.0	7.95	0.316	13.13	0.606	0.512	0.703	3.347	0.250
10.0	16.07	0.390	27.24	0.587	0.506	0.729	3.530	0.247

[a] For O$= 2.580 \times 10^{-3}$ with the exception of the last model which is for O$= 1.616 \times 10^{-3}$

TABLE 5

OUTFLOW OF O-RICH MATERIAL[a]

t_g (Gyr)	γ	r	$\frac{O}{Z}$	$\frac{\Delta Y}{\Delta O}$	$\frac{Z-C-O}{O}$	$\frac{C}{O}$	M^e_{gas}/M_T (10^{-2})
0.10	0.00	3.240	0.576	1.783	0.601	0.135	0.910
	0.25	2.442	0.562	1.938	0.642	0.137	1.366
	0.50	1.644	0.536	2.287	0.723	0.141	2.276
	0.75	0.847	0.467	3.372	0.988	0.155	5.159
	0.90	0.370	0.315	7.016	1.939	0.231	14.34
1.00	0.00	3.290	0.519	2.597	0.702	0.225	0.910
	0.25	2.497	0.489	3.023	0.787	0.257	1.442
	0.50	1.704	0.437	3.953	0.963	0.325	2.428
	0.75	0.910	0.321	6.860	1.566	0.553	5.539
	0.90	0.453	0.165	15.659	3.470	1.604	14.72
10.0	0.00	3.390	0.516	2.946	0.700	0.240	0.910
	0.25	2.599	0.485	3.527	0.784	0.277	1.442
	0.50	1.807	0.431	4.729	0.966	0.356	2.656
	0.75	1.013	0.331	8.411	1.593	0.622	5.615
	0.90	0.562	0.157	19.380	3.519	1.853	14.64
10.0	0.00	5.291	0.510	2.970	0.725	0.235	0.910
	0.25	4.026	0.484	3.527	0.798	0.270	1.214
	0.50	2.760	0.437	4.641	0.948	0.341	1.897
	0.75	1.495	0.331	8.045	1.456	0.561	3.794
	0.90	0.744	0.175	18.750	3.376	1.351	9.712

[a] For O = 2.580×10^{-3} with the exception of the last five models which are for O = 1.616×10^{-3}

TABLE 6

ISM ABUNDANCES BUDGET

MODELS WITH AN OUTFLOW OF O-RICH MATERIAL

t_g (Gyr)	γ	i	SF	GW	LMS	HMS$_W$	HMS$_{SN}$	X_i
0.10	0.25	He	$-5.670 \cdot 10^{-1}$	$-5.466 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$4.992 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$1.876 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$2.190 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$2.350 \cdot 10^{-1}$
		C	$-2.839 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$-2.048 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$1.114 \cdot 10^{-5}$	$1.195 \cdot 10^{-5}$	$8.195 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$3.538 \cdot 10^{-4}$
		O	$-2.342 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$-1.636 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$5.118 \cdot 10^{-6}$	$8.281 \cdot 10^{-6}$	$6.544 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$2.580 \cdot 10^{-3}$
		Z	$-3.901 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$-2.632 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$3.121 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$2.798 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$1.053 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$4.589 \cdot 10^{-3}$
	0.50	He	$-5.767 \cdot 10^{-1}$	$-1.650 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$7.555 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$2.861 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$3.307 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$2.359 \cdot 10^{-1}$
		C	$-2.911 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$-6.184 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$1.686 \cdot 10^{-5}$	$1.942 \cdot 10^{-5}$	$1.237 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$3.638 \cdot 10^{-4}$
		O	$-2.381 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$-4.940 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$7.760 \cdot 10^{-6}$	$1.293 \cdot 10^{-5}$	$9.880 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$2.580 \cdot 10^{-3}$
		Z	$-4.038 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$-7.940 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$4.724 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$4.349 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$1.588 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$4.810 \cdot 10^{-3}$
	0.75	He	$-6.075 \cdot 10^{-1}$	$-5.052 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$1.554 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$6.024 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$6.749 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$2.387 \cdot 10^{-1}$
		C	$-3.155 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$-1.893 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$3.467 \cdot 10^{-5}$	$4.949 \cdot 10^{-5}$	$2.525 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$4.002 \cdot 10^{-4}$
		O	$-2.506 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$-1.512 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$1.605 \cdot 10^{-5}$	$2.937 \cdot 10^{-5}$	$2.016 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$2.580 \cdot 10^{-3}$
		Z	$-4.490 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$-2.423 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$9.719 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$9.676 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$3.231 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$5.530 \cdot 10^{-3}$
10.0	0.25	He	$-6.181 \cdot 10^{-1}$	$-6.035 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$5.759 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$2.368 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$2.422 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$2.391 \cdot 10^{-1}$
		C	$-7.262 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$-2.250 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$7.403 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$2.652 \cdot 10^{-5}$	$9.001 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$7.158 \cdot 10^{-4}$
		O	$-2.771 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$-1.712 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$2.013 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$1.363 \cdot 10^{-5}$	$6.847 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$2.580 \cdot 10^{-3}$
		Z	$-5.695 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$-2.739 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$2.331 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$4.631 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$1.096 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$5.318 \cdot 10^{-3}$
	0.50	He	$-6.564 \cdot 10^{-1}$	$-1.829 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$8.791 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$3.871 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$3.669 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$2.422 \cdot 10^{-1}$
		C	$-9.699 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$-6.867 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$1.147 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$5.444 \cdot 10^{-5}$	$1.374 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$9.187 \cdot 10^{-4}$
		O	$-2.943 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$-5.193 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$3.063 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$2.470 \cdot 10^{-5}$	$1.039 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$2.580 \cdot 10^{-3}$
		Z	$-6.679 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$-8.245 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$3.605 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$8.172 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$1.649 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$5.991 \cdot 10^{-3}$
	0.75	He	$-7.718 \cdot 10^{-1}$	$-5.609 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$1.841 \cdot 10^{-1}$	$9.868 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$7.502 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$2.517 \cdot 10^{-1}$
		C	$-1.874 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$-2.154 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$2.517 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$2.426 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$2.873 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$1.604 \cdot 10^{-3}$
		O	$-3.458 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$-1.595 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$6.321 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$8.602 \cdot 10^{-5}$	$2.127 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$2.580 \cdot 10^{-3}$
		Z	$-1.028 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$-2.476 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$7.874 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$2.447 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$3.301 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$8.294 \cdot 10^{-3}$
10.0	0.25	He	$-5.903 \cdot 10^{-1}$	$-3.805 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$3.553 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$1.112 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$1.527 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$2.357 \cdot 10^{-1}$
		C	$-4.295 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$-1.387 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$4.452 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$4.184 \cdot 10^{-6}$	$5.550 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$4.362 \cdot 10^{-4}$
		O	$-1.655 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$-1.062 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$8.102 \cdot 10^{-5}$	$3.208 \cdot 10^{-6}$	$4.249 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$1.616 \cdot 10^{-3}$
		Z	$-3.411 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$-1.756 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$1.353 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$1.309 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$7.023 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$3.341 \cdot 10^{-3}$
	0.50	He	$-6.121 \cdot 10^{-1}$	$-1.146 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$5.371 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$1.765 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$2.300 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$2.375 \cdot 10^{-1}$
		C	$-5.566 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$-4.197 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$6.790 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$8.682 \cdot 10^{-6}$	$8.397 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$5.510 \cdot 10^{-4}$
		O	$-1.715 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$-3.203 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$1.226 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$5.508 \cdot 10^{-6}$	$6.406 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$1.616 \cdot 10^{-3}$
		Z	$-3.868 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$-5.269 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$2.063 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$2.351 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$1.054 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$3.699 \cdot 10^{-3}$
	0.75	He	$-6.801 \cdot 10^{-1}$	$-3.479 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$1.100 \cdot 10^{-1}$	$4.171 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$4.653 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$2.430 \cdot 10^{-1}$
		C	$-9.903 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$-1.291 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$1.428 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$3.823 \cdot 10^{-5}$	$1.722 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$9.068 \cdot 10^{-4}$
		O	$-1.901 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$-9.748 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$2.505 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$1.675 \cdot 10^{-5}$	$1.300 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$1.616 \cdot 10^{-3}$
		Z	$-5.453 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$-1.580 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$4.335 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$7.251 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$2.106 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$4.876 \cdot 10^{-3}$